REMARKS

Claims 97-99, 103-109, 112, 113 and 115-133 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 97-99, 104-107, 109, 112, 115, 117, 121-122, 129 and 132-133 are amended. Claim 103 is canceled. No new matter is added.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

On March 22, 2010, the Examiner and Applicants' representatives (Fengling Li, Reg. No. 62,962 and Antonia L. Sequeira, Reg. No. 54,670) had a telephone conversation during which they discussed the rejection of claim 97 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) over Horn reference and proposed claim amendments. No agreement was reached, though the Examiner stated that, based on her review of the Horn reference during the phone call, she did not see the claimed invention disclosed in Horn.

Claims 97, 103-105, 107-109, 112-113, 120-121, 128 and 130 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Horn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,013,289) ("Horn"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 97 recites a computer-implemented method for displaying information about a product from a plurality of articles, comprising:

in response to receiving a search query for a product, searching an index of articles that describe products for sale;
identifying, based on the index searching, a plurality of articles from the index of articles that are responsive to the search query;
obtaining, based on the search query, at least one price for the product and at least one image of the product from each of the identified articles by:
automatically selecting and extracting a price for the product from a first article of the identified articles by:
identifying a potential price in the first article;
identifying a price signal associated with the identified potential price in the first article;

determining, based on a proximity metric, whether the price signal indicates that the identified potential price is an actual price for the product;

responsive to a positive determination, automatically extracting the actual price from the first article;

automatically selecting and extracting an image for the product from the first article based on the extracted price;

repeating the selection and the extraction of prices and images for other identified articles; and

displaying, as a combined search result set, prices extracted and images extracted for the product from the identified articles.

In response to receiving a search query for a product (e.g., a polo shirt),the claimed invention identifies articles that are responsive to the search query (e.g., a Wal-Mart web page describing a polo shirt, a Macy's web page describing a polo shirt, etc.), automatically selects and extracts a price and an image for the product from each of the articles, and displays the prices/images extracted in a search result (e.g., a price/image for the Wal-Mart polo shirt, a price/image for the Macy's polo shirt, etc.). Specifically, in the selection/extraction of the price from an article, the claimed method (1) identifies a potential price in the article (e.g., identifies "$12.99" in the Wal-Mart web page as a potential price; *see* specification, ¶[0024]); (2) identifies a price signal associated with the identified potential price (e.g., the distance between the "$12.99" text and the word "price," the font of the "$12.99" text, etc.; *see* specification, ¶[0032]); (3) determines, based on a proximity metric, whether the price signal indicates an actual price for the product (e.g., determines that $12.99 is the actual Wal-Mart polo shirt price; *see* specification, ¶[0033]); and (4) responsive to a positive determination, automatically extracts the actual price from the article (*see* specification, ¶[0039]). The claimed invention also automatically selects and extracts an image for the product (e.g., a polo shirt image) based on the extracted price (*see* specification, ¶[0031]). In this manner, the claimed invention can select/extract an actual price for the product

(e.g., rather than other non-price numbers or prices of other products) and can select/extract an image based on the price.

Horn does not disclose or teach the claimed features regarding automatic selection/extraction of a price. The Examiner cited column 13, lines 46-48, column 20, lines 44-47, and column 42, lines 62-67 to allegedly disclose the claimed features regarding product price extraction. Column 13, lines 46-48 of Horn describe that manufactures may build a worldwide brand name based on authentic products, ethical representations, fair prices and good service to buyers. However, Horn's brand name building based on variety of criteria is neither equivalent to nor discloses the claimed product price extraction. Horn fails to identify a potential price of a searched product and a price signal associated with the potential price, let alone extract an actual price of the product responsive to a positive determination based on a proximity metric as claimed.

Column 20, lines 44-47 of Horn merely discloses a currency ratio table which is used for translating amounts from one currency to another. This portion of Horn, similar to column 13, lines 46-48, fails to disclose the claimed product price extraction. Horn's currency ratio table is not equivalent to the product price extraction, and does not disclose or teach the claimed product price extraction.

Column 42, lines 62-67 merely discloses a user navigating through drop down menus to locate products of interest, such as by selecting "Apparel" from the drop-down menu and selecting "Women's Apparel" on the sub-menu, and then reviewing a web page with price and other information. *See also* Horn, col. 15, lines 28-45; col. 33, lines 25-42; col. 34, lines 41-67; col. 35, lines 1-13. However, the mere fact that a price for a product is displayed on a web page does not imply that the system has selected and extracted that price from an article for

presentation in a combined search result set. Even assuming for the sake of argument that a selection/extraction occurred, Horn does not describe identifying a potential price and a price signal, determining whether the potential price is an actual price using a proximity metric, and automatically extracting the price responsive to a positive determination. Thus, Horn fails to disclose the automatic selection/extraction of a price.

Furthermore, Horn does not disclose or teach the claimed "automatically selecting and extracting an image for the product from the first article based on the actual price." The Examiner cited column 42, lines 62-67 of Horn to allegedly disclose the claimed feature. This portion of Horn describes providing a web page to a buyer that include images for products. The mere fact that an image for a product is displayed on a web page does not imply that the system has selected or extracted that image for the product, much less selected the image based on the actual price. Rather, the conventional web pages described by Horn are simply pre-programmed to include the images. *See* Horn, col. 42, line 62 to col. 43, line 45. Thus, Horn fails to disclose this element of claim 97.

The other independent claims (claims 120 and 121) are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 97.

Accordingly, Horn fails to disclose all of the elements of the independent claims, and so cannot disclose all of the elements of the claims depending therefrom. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 98-99, 115-119, 122-127, 129 and 131-133 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn and Aggarwal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,706) ("Aggarwal"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Aggarwal does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Horn. Aggarwal describes searching product catalogs and attempts to improve search results by learning an "implied concept" of a shopper's search activity. *See* Aggarwal, Abstract and col. 3, lines 14-38. Specifically, Aggarwal provides search results by evaluating "similarity functions." Aggarwal, col. 3, lines 62 to col. 4, line 20. A similarity function computes a similarity score for products stored in a product database based on features of the products. *See* Aggarwal, col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 9. For example, a similarity function might compute a similarity score for sedans or t-shirts. *See* Aggarwal, col. 10, lines 48-67. Hence, Aggarwal's "similarity functions" are used to select products from a database, not prices/images from an article. Aggarwal does not teach each of the elements described above to be missing from Horn.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references fails to disclose all of the elements of the dependent claims, and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 106 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Horn, Aggarwal in view of Venkatraman et al. (WO/0113273) ("Venkatraman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Venkatraman also does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Horn and Aggarwal. Venkatraman discusses searching "for nodes of a stored data structure that satisfy a received search result." *See* Venkatraman, Abstract. However, Venkatraman fails to disclose the elements cited above as missing from Horn. Although Figures 1C and 1D of Venkatraman illustrate the display of images on a web page, these figures are merely illustrations of conventional web pages preprogrammed to include images. As stated above, the mere fact that a price/image for a product is *displayed* on a web page does not imply that the system has *selected*

or extracted that price/image for the product, much less selected/extracted the image based on the price.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 106, and Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 24, 2010 By: /Fengling Li/

Fengling Li, Reg. No. 62,962
Patent Agent
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel. (650) 335-7182
Fax (650) 938-5200